



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

Applicant	Eastern Municipal Water District	County	Riverside
Project Title	San Jacinto Groundwater Compliance Management Tool Project	Grant Request	\$ 250,000.00
		Total Project Cost	\$ 387,000.00

Project Description: The Proposal creates the San Jacinto Groundwater Compliance Management Tool, a forecast tool showing the impacts of projects directed at improving local drought reliability, mitigating high salt loads, minimizing recycled water discharge and optimizing the use of local groundwater storage, which will enhance the Regional Groundwater Model (completed in 2002).

Evaluation Summary:

Scoring Criterion	Score
GWMP or Program	5
Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed	4
Work Plan	10
Budget	3
Schedule	4
QA/QC	5
Past Performance	4
Geographical Balance	0
Total Score	35

- **GWMP or Program:** The criterion is fully addressed and supported by thorough documentation. A copy of a resolution approved by the Board of directors of EMWD adopting the West San Jacinto Groundwater Basin Management Plan (Resolution 3156) is provided in the application. Review of a copy of the Hemet/San Jacinto Water Management Plan indicates that EMWD has prepared and implemented the plan under court judgments (adjudication) and interim memorandums of understanding with various stakeholders. EMWD also provided a copy of a resolution approved by the Board of Directors adopting and certifying the final Supplemental Environmental Impact Report for the Hemet/San Jacinto Water Management Plan.
- **Technical Adequacy of Work to be Performed:** The application addresses the criterion but does not provide thorough documentation. The application provides a detailed description of the proposed project including goals of the proposal and the affected area. In addition, the applicant demonstrates collaboration with other local public agencies with regards to the management of the affected groundwater basins. The application also demonstrates long-term need and merit for the Groundwater Compliance Management Tool Project (MTP) as a planning tool. The MTP intends to refine and expand on an existing groundwater model; however, the applicant does not clearly describe the level of new knowledge and improvement in groundwater management by the project, particularly in regards to the existing GWMP's goals and objectives claimed. For example, under the GWMP goal/objective "Ensure reliable water supply/minimize dependence on imported water," the applicant claims that by using the MTP to maximize the use of local groundwater reservoirs they would be ensuring a reliable water supply but they fail to provide specifics on how this would be accomplished. The applicant did clearly explain how ongoing use of the MTP would be funded once grant funds are expended (e.g., by an administrative pumping assessment).



PROPOSAL EVALUATION

IRWM Grant Program – Local Groundwater Assistance, FY 2012-2013

- **Work Plan:** The criterion is fully addressed but documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The application describes the tasks in sufficient detail to determine what will be done and what the product will be. Overall, the tasks are consistent with the schedule and budget, and can reasonably fulfill the objectives of the proposal. The tasks do relate to improving groundwater management including supporting the GWMPs (and the information will be shared with the region's IRWMP). All tasks are focused on making the existing groundwater flow model more accurate and thus suitable for performing model simulation runs to evaluate the relative cost-effectiveness of projects to recharge the groundwater basin. This is consistent with the GWMP goal of monitoring and developing a cost-effective reliable water supply. It is assumed the need to access private property will not be necessary. The applicant states the project will not require physical construction or environmental disturbance so no CEQA/NEPA delays are anticipated. The discussion of compliance with CEQA is addressed in the schedule section.
- **Budget:** The criterion is less than fully addressed and documentation or rationales are incomplete or insufficient. The budget is consistent with the Work Plan and Schedule, and presents cost share and grant share amount consistent with those two attachments. The proposal also identifies other sources of funding and how each task pertains to them. The application includes a budget table, but did not provided explanatory text or other cost details to demonstrate that the cost are realistic. While the overall costs seem reasonable, the applicant does not provide any backup documentation that details the task costs broken down into categories including professionals' labor hours and rates (e.g., a hydrogeologic consultant's cost estimate).
- **Schedule:** The application addresses the criteria but is not thoroughly documented. The timelines seem reasonable for the work to be performed. However, the proposal does not present appropriate detailed information defining how the schedule was derived, but does state that the project will be able to proceed when funding becomes available from the start date being used.
- **QA/QC:** The criterion is fully addressed. The applicant cites that professionals performing the work will have proper certifications and licensures. In addition, the applicant describes appropriate activities for evaluating the quality of work being performed and methods for revising the model refinements based in recommendations of a peer review panel. The applicant also cites standard operating procedures that are in place for the monitoring activities needed to gather data for the model creation and refinements.
- **Past Performance:** The applicant did not fully address the criterion and documentation is incomplete or insufficient. The applicant described projects which they state were completed successfully, including a study done with funding from DWR and another with USBR. However, the applicant did not provide supporting documentation and, therefore, the statements could not be verified.